

### **REMARKS**

Claims 19-21 and 23-44 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-18 and 22 have been previously canceled. Claims 19, 20, 23-26, 33-35 and 37-41 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the Specification and at least at page 4, lines 21-29 and page 11, 1-10. No new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and allowance of all pending claims in view of the reasons set forth below.

#### **I. Objection to Claims**

Claims 19-21 and 23-33 are objected to because of formalities.

Regarding claim 19, the Examiner indicates that the recitation of “data” should be “the received data”, the recitation of “memory” should be “the first memory” and the recitation of “the computer” should be “the computer system”.

Applicants amend claim 19 to recite “the received data”, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants believe that the amended claim 19 does not require the recitation of a computer system and the first memory. Applicants believe that the amendments address the Examiner’s concerns. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to claims 19-21 and 23-33.

#### **II. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

##### **A. Claims 19-21, 27-29, 31, 33-34, 36, and 42-44**

Claims 19-21, 27-29, 31, 33-34, 36, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,256,625 B1 to Breyer et al. (hereafter “Breyer”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,911,066 to Williams et al (hereafter “Williams”) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,593,947 B1 to Ashe et al (hereafter “Ashe”).

1. Claim 19

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *sharing the data object among the one or more registered data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the received data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*, as provided in Applicants' amended claim 19.

The Examiner correctly indicates that Breyer modified by Williams does not explicitly disclose *sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data*. See Office Action, page 4, § 9. However, the Examiner asserts that Ashe teaches this claim element. See Office Action, page 4, § 10. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Ashe generally discusses specification and design of customized elements, including menus, buttons, and lists, in a graphical user interface. See Col. 2, lines 62-65. The operating system of Ashe includes an imaging object structure which is an object oriented class hierarchy of imaging objects. See Col. 3, lines 16-18. The imaging object structure provides imaging objects for use in a GUI, including GUI elements, such as menus, buttons and lists. See Col. 3, lines 29-31.

The sections of Ashe cited by the Examiner as teaching *sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data* merely indicate that the ability to define references to imaging object reference data allows sharing of images among elements of the GUI. See Col. 5, lines 62-64. As provided above, Ashe further defines the elements of GUI as menus, buttons and lists. See Col. 3, lines 31-32. Thus, in Ashe, the imaging object reference data is merely shared among buttons or elements that appear on the GUI, as opposed to the data sink objects including application software tools or output devices. As such, Ashe does not disclose or suggest that *sharing the data object among the one or more registered data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the received data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*, as provided in Applicants' amended claim 19.

In addition, the cited references, alone or in any reasonable combination, further fail to disclose or suggest *registering one or more of the plurality of data sink objects with the data*

*server object*, as recited in Applicants' claim 19. Regarding the *registering* feature, the Examiner cites Williams. *See* Office Action, page 5, § 12. However, the cited section of Williams discusses the data sink registering with a window manager to indicate that the data sink is available for a drop in a drag-and-drop operation. *See* Col. 16, lines 8-10. However, nowhere does Williams disclose or suggest that the data sink includes an application software tool or an output device. Moreover, in Williams, the data sink registers with the window manager as opposed to a data server object, as provided in Applicants' claim 19.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Breyer, Williams and Ashe fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

## 2. Claims 20-21, 27-29, 31 and 33

Claims 20, 21, 27-29, 31 and 33 depend from amended claim 19 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of amended claim 19. In light of the arguments presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 20, 21, 27, 28, 31 and 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 20, 21, 27-29, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

## 3. Claim 34

Claim 34 recites similar elements to amended claim 19. Specifically, claim 34 recites, among other elements, *sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*. In light of the arguments presented above for claim 19, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least this claim element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

4. Claims 36, 42 and 44

Claims 36, 42 and 43 depend from claim 34 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of claim 34. In light of the arguments presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 36, 42 and 43. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 36, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. Claims 23-26

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer in view of Williams and Ashe, and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,523,191 to Thomas et al, (hereafter “Thomas”).

As presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest *sharing the data object among the one or more registered data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the received data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*, as provided in Applicants’ amended claim 19. Claims 23-26 depend from claim 19 and, as such, incorporate the patentable subject matter of claim 19. Thomas fails at curing the shortcomings of Breyer, Williams and Ashe with regard to at least this claim element.

Thomas does not disclose or suggest *sharing the data object among the one or more registered data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the received data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*, as recited in claim 19. Thomas discusses monitoring usage of an electronic device using a client component installed in a client device. A data analysis component determines usage statistics associated with application programs installed on the client device based upon the usage data. The collected data may include measurements of usage time, number of uses, and sequence of usage of specified ones of the application programs. Thomas also discusses monitoring user interaction with a web page downloaded to the client device from a remote location. *See* Col. 2, lines 7-36. However, Thomas is silent about *sharing the data object among the one or more registered data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the*

*received data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*, as recited in claim 19.

Breyer, Williams, Ashe and Thomas, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of amended claim 19. Accordingly, claims 23-26 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### C. Claims 30 and 32

Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer, in view of Williams and Ashe, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0041163 A1 to Rhoades et al. (hereinafter “Rhoades”).

As presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest *sharing the data object among the one or more registered data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the received data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*, as recited in amended claim 19. Claims 30 and 32 depend from claim 19 and, as such, incorporate the patentable subject matter of claim 19. Rhoades fails at curing the shortcomings of Breyer, Williams and Ashe with regard to at least this claim element.

The sections of Rhoades identified by the Examiner discuss real-time streams of data that can be framed into self contained segments [0127]. Rhoades also discusses that streams of datagrams flow between processors [0132]. Rhoades further discusses forwarding the datagrams as a whole [0151]. Thus, Rhoades does not disclose or suggest *sharing the data object among the one or more registered data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the received data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*, as recited in claim 19.

Breyer, Williams, Ashe and Rhoades, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 19. Accordingly, claims 30 and 32 is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

D. Claims 35 and 37-41

Claims 35, 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer, in view of Williams and Ashe, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,823,524 B1 to Hewett, (hereafter “Hewett”).

As presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest *sharing the data object among the one or more registered data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the received data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*, as recited in claim 34. Claims 35 and 37-41 depend from claim 34 and, as such, incorporate the patentable subject matter of claim 34. Hewett fails at curing the shortcomings of Breyer, Williams and Ashe with regard to at least this claim element.

Hewett is cited by the Examiner to provide teachings for the feature added in claims 35 and 37-41. Hewett discusses managing the distribution of events in a data processing system. Hewett, however, does not disclose or suggest *sharing the data object among the one or more registered data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the received data* where the data sink objects include *one or more application software tools or a representation of one or more output devices*, as recited in claim 34.

Breyer, Williams, Ashe and Hewett, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 34. Accordingly, claims 35 and 37-41 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 35 and 37-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-035RCE2. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: October 2, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:/Neslihan I. Doran/  
Neslihan I. Doran  
Registration No.: 64,883  
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127  
(617) 227-7400  
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicant